

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1, 3-18, and 20-21 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 14, and 17 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated January 25, 2005, Claims 1, 3-18, and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 3-18, and 20-21 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Amendment to the Specification

The specification has been amended to correct a typographical error. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment adds no new matter.

II. Rejection of the Claims 1, 3, and 4 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action dated January 25, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,553,221 ("*Nakamura*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,386,460 ("*Boakes*"). Claim 1 has been amended to further define and clarify the invention, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "obtaining caller identification information on the calling party from one of a caller name database if the calling party is calling from a wire line and the caller name database or a home location register if the calling party is calling from a wireless line", "the caller identification information being stored in one of

a service control point and the home location register”, and “if the wireless telephone becomes registered to receive calls and if it is determined that the wireless telephone is capable of receiving a missing call message directing a user to a missing call log, forwarding.”

In contrast, *Nakamura* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitations. For example, *Nakamura* discloses an incoming call notification apparatus. Furthermore, *Boakes* does not overcome *Nakamura*’s deficiencies. *Boakes* merely discloses a feature configurable telephone terminal.

Combining *Nakamura* with *Boakes* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Nakamura* and *Boakes*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose “obtaining caller identification information on the calling party from one of a caller name database if the calling party is calling from a wire line and the caller name database or a home location register if the calling party is calling from a wireless line”, “the caller identification information being stored in one of a service control point and the home location register”, or “if the wireless telephone becomes registered to receive calls and if it is determined that the wireless telephone is capable of receiving a missing call message directing a user to a missing call log, forwarding”, as recited by amended Claim 1. Accordingly, independent Claim 1 patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 3 and 4 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 1, and by virtue of their dependency upon

independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 3 and 4.

III. Rejection of Claims 7 and 8 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nakamura* in view of *Boakes* further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,997 ("*Farris*"). Dependent Claims 7 and 8 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least for the reason that they include, due to their dependency on amended independent Claim 1, the recitation from Claim 1 as described above with respect to Section II.

In contrast, *Nakamura* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitations. For example, *Nakamura* discloses an incoming call notification apparatus. Furthermore, *Boakes* does not overcome *Nakamura's* deficiencies. *Boakes* merely discloses a feature configurable telephone terminal. Moreover, *Farris* does not overcome *Nakamura's* and *Boakes's* deficiencies. *Farris* merely discloses a system for sending control signals from a subscriber station to a network controller using cellular digital packet data (CDPD) communication.

Combining *Nakamura* with *Boakes* and *Farris* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Nakamura*, *Boakes*, and *Farris*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose the recitation from Claim 1 as described above with respect to Section I, as included in dependent Claims 7 and 8. Accordingly, dependent Claims 7 and 8 patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 7 and 8.

IV. Rejection of Claims 10 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nakamura* in view of *Boakes* further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,974,309 ("*Foti*"). Dependent Claims 10 and 11 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least for the reason that they include, due to their dependency on amended independent Claim 1, the recitation from Claim 1 as described above with respect to Section II.

In contrast, *Nakamura* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitations. For example, *Nakamura* discloses an incoming call notification apparatus. Furthermore, *Boakes* does not overcome *Nakamura's* deficiencies. *Boakes* merely discloses a feature configurable telephone terminal. Moreover, *Foti* does not overcome *Nakamura's* and *Boakes's* deficiencies. *Foti* merely discloses a method and apparatus for facilitating law enforcement agency monitoring of cellular telephone calls.

Combining *Nakamura* with *Boakes* and *Foti* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Nakamura*, *Boakes*, and *Foti*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose the recitation from Claim 1 as described above with respect to Section I, as included in dependent Claims 10 and 11. Accordingly, dependent Claims 10 and 11 patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 10 and 11.

V. Rejection of the Claims 1, 3-6, 9, and 12-16 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3-6, 9, and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,311,057 ("*Barvesten*") in view of *Nakamura* further in view of *Boakes*. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to further define and clarify the invention, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "obtaining caller identification information on the calling party from one of a caller name database if the calling parting is calling from a wire line and the caller name database or a home location register if the calling parting is calling from a wireless line", "the caller identification information being stored in one of a service control point and the home location register", and "if the wireless telephone becomes registered to receive calls and if it is determined that the wireless telephone is capable of receiving a missing call message directing a user to a missing call log, forwarding." Amended Claim 14 includes a similar recitation.

In contrast, *Barvesten* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitations. For example, *Barvesten* discloses a method of calling a mobile station in a mobile telephone system. Furthermore, *Nakamura* does not overcome *Barvesten's* deficiencies. *Nakamura* merely discloses an incoming call notification apparatus. Moreover, *Boakes* does not overcome *Barvesten's* and *Nakamura's* deficiencies. *Boakes* merely discloses a feature configurable telephone terminal.

Combining *Barvesten* with *Nakamura* and *Boakes* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Barvesten*, *Nakamura*, and *Boakes*, either individually or in

combination, at least do not disclose "obtaining caller identification information on the calling party from one of a caller name database if the calling party is calling from a wire line and the caller name database or a home location register if the calling party is calling from a wireless line", "the caller identification information being stored in one of a service control point and the home location register", or "if the wireless telephone becomes registered to receive calls and if it is determined that the wireless telephone is capable of receiving a missing call message directing a user to a missing call log, forwarding", as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 14 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 14 each patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1 and 14.

Dependent Claims 3-6, 9, 12-13, and 15-16 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 14, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 3-6, 9, 12-13, and 15-16.

VI. Rejection of the Claim 17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,930,701 ("*Skog*") in view of *Nakamura* further in view of *Boakes*. Claim 17 has been amended to further define and clarify the invention, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

Amended Claim 17 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, “a wireless switch operative to...obtain caller identification information on the calling party from one of a caller name database if the calling party is calling from a wire line and the caller name database or a home location register if the calling party is calling from a wireless line”, “the caller identification information being stored in one of a service control point and the home location register”, and “a wireless switch operative to forward...if the wireless telephone becomes registered to receive calls and if it is determined that the wireless telephone is capable of receiving a missing call message directing a user to a missing call log, forwarding.”

In contrast, *Skog* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitations. For example, *Skog* discloses providing caller ID within a mobile telecommunications network. Furthermore, *Nakamura* does not overcome *Skog*'s deficiencies. *Nakamura* merely discloses an incoming call notification apparatus. Moreover, *Boakes* does not overcome *Skog*'s and *Nakamura*'s deficiencies. *Boakes* merely discloses a feature configurable telephone terminal.

Combining *Skog* with *Nakamura* and *Boakes* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Skog*, *Nakamura*, and *Boakes*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose “a wireless switch operative to...obtain caller identification information on the calling party from one of a caller name database if the calling party is calling from a wire line and the caller name database or a home location register if the calling party is calling from a wireless line”, “the caller identification information being stored in one of a service control point and the home location register”, or “a wireless

switch operative to forward...if the wireless telephone becomes registered to receive calls and if it is determined that the wireless telephone is capable of receiving a missing call message directing a user to a missing call log, forwarding”, as recited by amended Claim 17. Accordingly, independent Claim 17 patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 17.

VII. Rejection of Claim 18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Skog* in view of *Nakamura* further in view of *Boakes* further in view of *Farris*. Dependent Claim 18 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least for the reason that it includes, due to its dependency on amended independent Claim 17, the recitation from Claim 17 as described above with respect to Section VI.

In contrast, *Skog* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitations. For example, *Skog* discloses providing caller ID within a mobile telecommunications network. Furthermore, *Nakamura* does not overcome *Skog*'s deficiencies. *Nakamura* merely discloses an incoming call notification apparatus. Moreover, *Boakes* does not overcome *Skog*'s and *Nakamura*'s deficiencies. *Boakes* merely discloses a feature configurable telephone terminal. Also, *Farris* does not overcome *Skog*'s, *Nakamura*'s, and *Farris*' deficiencies. *Farris* merely discloses a system for sending control signals from a subscriber station to a network controller using cellular digital packet data (CDPD) communication.

Combining *Skog* with *Nakamura*, *Boakes*, and *Farris* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Skog*, *Nakamura*, *Boakes*, and *Farris*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose the recitation from Claim 17 as described above with respect to Section VI, as included in dependent Claim 18. Accordingly, dependent Claim 18 patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claim 18.

VIII. Rejection of Claims 20 and 21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Skog* in view of *Nakamura* further in view of *Boakes* further in view of *Barvesten*. Dependent Claims 20 and 21 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least for the reason that they include, due to their dependency on amended independent Claim 17, the recitation from Claim 17 as described above with respect to Section VI.

In contrast, *Skog* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitations. For example, *Skog* discloses providing caller ID within a mobile telecommunications network. Furthermore, *Nakamura* does not overcome *Skog*'s deficiencies. *Nakamura* merely discloses an incoming call notification apparatus. Moreover, *Boakes* does not overcome *Skog*'s and *Nakamura*'s deficiencies. *Boakes* merely discloses a feature configurable telephone terminal. Also, *Barvesten* does not overcome *Skog*'s, *Nakamura*'s, and *Barvesten* deficiencies. *Barvesten* merely discloses a method of calling a mobile station in a mobile telephone system.

Combining *Skog* with *Nakamura*, *Boakes*, and *Barvesten* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Skog*, *Nakamura*, *Boakes*, and *Barvesten*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose the recitation from Claim 17 as described above with respect to Section VI, as included in dependent Claims 20 and 21. Accordingly, dependent Claims 20 and 21 patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 20 and 21.

IX. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that this Submission Under 37 C.F.R. §1.114 be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of

this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this amendment and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 18, 2005

By: 

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-9946
Telephone: 404.954.5066

DKS:mdp

